UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,801	08/30/2001	Dinesh Sheth	A00067US	3215

36536 7590 09/22/2005		

WYATT, TARRANT & COMBS, LLP
1715 AARON BRENNER DRIVE
SUITE 800
MEMPHIS, TN 38120-4367

EXAMINER
THERIAULT, STEVEN B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/943,801	SHETH ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Steven B. Theriault	2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 June 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *8,9,16,37,38,41 and 42* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *8,9,16,37,38,41 and 42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *28 March 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment filed on 06/27/2005.

2.   Claims 8, 9, 16, 37, 38, 41 and 42 are pending in the case. Claims 1-7, 10-15, 17-36, 39-40 and

43-49 have been cancelled. Claim 8, 16, 37, and 41 are the independent claims. Claims 8, 16

and 42 are the amended claims

Drawings

3.   The Examiner acknowledges the corrections to the specification regarding the drawings and

withdraws the objection and the drawings are now acceptable.

4.   The Examiner withdraws the objection to the specification and to the 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph

objection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness**

rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as
set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be
patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious
at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said
subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention
was made.

6.   **Claims 8, 9, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Kumar et al (hereinafter Kumar) U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0007330 A1 issued Jan.

17, 2002, and filed Apr. 4, 2001, and in view of Khan et al (hereinafter Khan) U.S. Patent

Publication No. 2002/0018078 A1 issued Feb. 14, 2002, and filed June 7, 2001.

In regard to **Independent claim 8,** Kumar teaches a computerized *method of*

aggregating and displaying Internet account information on a processor of a client, the client

processor having a display, the client processor operatively connected to a host server processor

via the Internet, comprising:

- *Displaying a view page on the display, said view page having three columns, each of said columns having at least one monitor therein;* (Kumar Figure 11) Kumar shows dashboard that presents aggregated account information in a display and where the display is configured with three columns (see also page 2, column 2, lines 55-67).

- *Populating said monitors with links to selected web sites;* (See Figure 2 and 11 and page 8, column 1, lines 40-67) Kumar teaches web agents and modules displayed within a page that are monitors that the user defines with the links employed to gather and summarize information from multiple sources into one place.

- *Retrieving data from said selected web-sites* (see Page 8, column 1, lines 50-60) Kumar teaches the retrieving of data from the Internet sites selected by the user.

- *Displaying said retrieved data in said monitors on said view page* (See Figure 11) Kumar expressly shows the displaying of information in said modules in a view page.

Kumar does not expressly disclose:

- *Creating and storing a **plurality of view pages** in a view page database of the host processor, each said view page containing monitors selectively populated by the user, and assigning a different name to each said view page to thereby distinguish said view pages from one another.*

Khan teaches a customizable network user interface that allows a user to create, edit or delete as many views as the user desires. Khan also teaches the process of monitoring the information located in the site (Khan page 6, column 2, lines 50-67), for the purpose of allowing a user to categorize related information into multiple views and windows. Khan also teaches the selection of a desired view and the disk storage for storing the marked information (Khan Figure 1 and page 5, column 2, lines 50-67). Khan teaches a database for the storage of content as it relates to a specific interface and user selections and is accessible from the interface that the user

selects to be added to the interface, therefore all of the view pages are stored within the database (see page 8, column 1, lines 1-20). Further, Khan teaches the ability to publish the user views into a directory of views, which would indicate distinguishing names or identifications for the organizing of the views within the directory (see page 6, column 2, lines 60-63). Khan and Kumar are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of using network based interfaces to provide a central location for users to access their predefined information.

Accordingly, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kumar and Khan before him at the time of the invention was made, to modify the system of Kumar to incorporate the multiple views of Khan and view database, in order to obtain a system that is able to provide multiple views of information to a user. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because of the need that allows a user to completely configure both the source and content that the users want in their portal as taught by Khan.

With respect to **dependent claim 9,** as indicated in the above discussion, Kumar in view of Khan teaches every element of claim 8.

Kumar fails to expressly teach the *method of selecting a desired view page via a graphical user interface of a displayed view page, retrieving said selected view page from said view page database, and displaying said selected view page on the display.*
However, Khan teaches a process of allowing a user to create, modify and edit a plurality of page views that comprise individual windows that contain customized content selected by the user (see figure 1 and page 6, column 2, lines 50-67 and page 8, column 1, lines 1-15) and where the content and view is retrieved from a database. Khan and Kumar are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of using network based interfaces to provide a central location for users to access their predefined information.

Accordingly, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kumar and Khan before him at the time of the invention was made, to modify the system of Kumar to incorporate the multiple views of Khan and view database, in order to obtain

a system that is able to provide multiple views of information to a user. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because of the need that allows a user to completely configure both the source and content that the users want in their portal as taught by Khan.

In regard to **Independent claim 37,** Kumar teaches [a computerized method of aggregating and displaying Internet account information on a processor of a client, the client processor having a display, the client processor operatively connected to a host server processor via the Internet, comprising:

- Each said view page having one or more columns, (Kumar figure 11) Kumar shows a display with three columns.

- *Each of said columns having at least one monitor therein* (Kumar figure 11) Kumar shows a display with three columns with more than one monitor in each.

- *Selecting a monitor from one of said columns of said selected view page via a graphical user interface, moving said selected monitor to a new position on said view page via a graphical user interface, and displaying said monitor in said new position on said view page.* (Kumar Fig. 17.) Kumar shows a graphical interface that has multiple windows with the standard set of windows controls attached. It is well known in the art on moving windows around an interface. Therefore, the account alerts window can be moved to a different column and displayed in the new location.

Kumar fails to expressly disclose:

- *Creating and storing a **plurality of view pages** in a view page database of the host processor,*

- *Assigning a different name to each said view page to thereby distinguish said view pages from one another,*

- *Selecting a view page from said view page database via a graphical user interface, retrieving said selected view page from said view page database, displaying said selected view page on the display,*

Khan teaches a customizable network user interface that allows a user to create, edit or delete as many views as the user desires. Khan also teaches the process of monitoring the information located in the site (Khan page 6, column 2, lines 50-67), for the purpose of allowing a user to categorize related information into multiple views and windows. Khan also teaches the selection of a desired view and the disk storage for storing the marked information (Khan Figure 1 and page 5, column 2, lines 50-67). Khan teaches a database for the storage of content as it relates to a specific interface and user selections and is accessible from the interface that the user selects to be added to the interface, therefore all of the view pages are stored within the database (see page 8, column 1, lines 1-20). Further, Khan teaches the ability to publish the user views into a directory of views, which would indicate distinguishing names or identifications for the organizing of the views within the directory (see page 6, column 2, lines 60-63). Khan and Kumar are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of using network based interfaces to provide a central location for users to access their predefined information.

Accordingly, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kumar and Khan before him at the time of the invention was made, to modify the system of Kumar to incorporate the multiple views of Khan and view database, in order to obtain a system that is able to provide multiple views of information to a user. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because of the need that allows a user to completely configure both the source and content that the users want in their portal as taught by Khan.

With respect to **dependent claim 38,** Kumar teaches *the client processor is a mobile device* (Kumar page 3, column 1, lines 15-25 and page 10, column 2, lines 1-10). Kumar teaches that cellular phones and hand-held devices are used with the invention.

7.   **Claims 16, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar et al (hereinafter Kumar) U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0007330 A1 issued Jan. 17, 2002, and filed Apr. 4, 2001, and in view of Flesner et al (hereinafter Flesner) U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0194267 A1 issued Dec. 19, 2002, and filed June 22, 2001.**

In regard to **Independent claim 16**, Kumar teaches a computerized method of aggregating and displaying Internet account information on a processor of a client, the client processor having a display, the client processor operatively connected to a host server processor via the Internet comprising:

- *Displaying a view page on the display, said view page having three columns, each of said columns having at least one monitor therein;* (Kumar Figure 11) Kumar shows dashboard that presents aggregated account information in a display and where the display is configured with three columns (see also page 2, column 2, lines 55-67).

- *Populating said monitors with links to selected web-sites;* See Figure 2 and 11 and page 8, column 1, lines 40-67) Kumar teaches web agents and modules displayed within a page that are monitors that the user defines with the links employed to gather and summarize information from multiple sources into one place.

- *Retrieving data from said selected web sites;* (see Page 8, column 1, lines 50-60) Kumar teaches the retrieving of data from the Internet sites selected by the user.

- *Displaying said retrieved data in said monitors on said view page;* (See Figure 11) Kumar expressly shows the displaying of information in said modules in a view page.

Kumar expressly suggests the ability of the user to customize the look and feel of the modules within the interface, which would inherently provide for the user the ability to change the color of each module (see page 17, column 1,lines 50-67). It is known in the common art the look and feel of the interface includes the colors, layout and behavior of elements within the interface. Further, the common definition of "look and feel" is

> **"Look and feel** refers to design aspects of a graphical user interface – in terms of both colours, shapes, layout, typefaces, etc (the "look"), and the behaviour of dynamic

elements such as buttons, boxes, and menus (the "feel"). It is used in reference to both software and websites." (see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Look_and_feel)

However, Kumar fails to expressly disclose:

- *Selectively modifying a **background color scheme** of at least one of said monitors of said view page, wherein modifying the background color scheme further comprises:*

    - Selecting a monitor to modify

    - Retrieving said selected monitor from a monitors database of the host processor,

    - Selecting a new display color for said selected monitor via a graphical interface

    - Storing said modified selected monitor in said monitors database,

    - Displaying an updated view page on the display of the client processor, said updated view page including said modified background color scheme of said selected monitor.

Flesner teaches a portal system that provides for aggregating content from the Internet in which individual windows are displayed on the interface containing the content (see figure 2) Flesner also teaches a Layout and color button (see page 3, column 1,lines 45-50) that allows a user to adjust the portal color scheme. Flesner further defines the ability to customize color settings and fonts of individual modules provided the user has the correct permission to update the module and for publishing the module, which would provide for the updating the database and displaying the page in the interface with the new settings. (See page 6, column 1, lines 1-15 and column 2, lines 58-67). Kumar and Flesner are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of providing account and content aggregation services to users to provide a single one-stop source of account information.

Accordingly, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kumar and Khan before him at the time of the invention was made, to modify the system of Kumar to incorporate the layout and color modification system of each module, in order to obtain a system that is able to provide customization features for each module or window. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because of the need to provide a single site for information located on plurality of different service provider's sites in a sufficiently broad and customizable manner as to keep users interested in aggregation portals as taught by Flesner (Page 1, column 1, lines 50-67).

In regard to **Independent claim 41,** Kumar teaches [a computerized method of aggregating and displaying Internet account information on a processor of a client, the client processor having a display, the client processor operatively connected to a host server processor via the Internet, comprising:]

- Displaying a view page on the display (Kumar figure7) Kumar shows the user computer with display monitor

- *A view page having one or more columns* (Kumar figure 11) Kumar shows a display with three columns.

- *Each of said columns having at least one monitor therein,* (Kumar figure 11) Kumar shows a display with three columns with more than one monitor in each

- *Populating said monitors with links to selected web-sites, retrieving data from said selected web-sites, displaying said retrieved data in said monitors on said view page,* (Kumar figure 5 and figure 17) Kumar teaches the process of populating the monitors with gatherer scripts, storing the information in a database and rendering the information in a web page.

- *Selecting a monitor to modify, retrieving said selected monitor from a monitor's database of the host processor* (Kumar page 17, column 1, lines 50-67) Kumar teaches that the content and data classifications can be changed within the interface.

Kumar also teaches the retrieval of monitors and displaying the modules on the

display page from a database (Kumar figure 8).

Kumar expressly suggests the ability of the user to customize the look and feel of the

modules within the interface, which would inherently provide for the user the ability to

change the color of each module (see page 17, column 1, lines 50-67). It is known in the

common art the look and feel of the interface includes the colors, layout and behavior of

elements within the interface. Further, the common definition of "look and feel" is

> **"Look and feel** refers to design aspects of a graphical user interface – in terms
> of both colours, shapes, layout, typefaces, etc (the "look"), and the behaviour of dynamic
> elements such as buttons, boxes, and menus (the "feel"). It is used in reference to both
> software and websites." (see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Look_and_feel)

However, Kumar fails to expressly disclose:

- ***Selecting a new display color*** *for said selected monitor via a graphical user interface,*

- *Storing said modified selected monitor in said monitors database, and displaying an*

  updated view page on the display of the client processor, said updated view page

  *including said **modified background color scheme** of said selected monitor.*

Flesner teaches a portal system that provides for aggregating content from the Internet in .

which individual windows are displayed on the interface containing the content (see figure 2)

Flesner also teaches a Layout and color button (see page 3, column 1, lines 45-50) that allows a

user to adjust the portal color scheme. Flesner further defines the ability to customize color

settings and fonts of individual modules provided the user has the correct permission to update

the module and for publishing the module, which would provide for the updating the database and

displaying the page in the interface with the new settings. (See page 6, column 1, lines 1-15 and

column 2, lines 58-67). Kumar and Flesner are analogous art because they are from the same

field of endeavor of providing account and content aggregation services to users to provide a

single one-stop source of account information.

Accordingly, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the

teachings of Kumar and Khan before him at the time of the invention was made, to modify the

system of Kumar to incorporate the layout and color modification system of each module, in order to obtain a system that is able to provide customization features for each module or window. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because of the need to provide a single site for information located on plurality of different service provider's sites in a sufficiently broad and customizable manner as to keep users interested in aggregation portals as taught by Flesner (Page 1, column 1, lines 50-67).

With respect to **dependent claim 42,** Kumar teaches the method where said processor is a mobile device. (Kumar page 3, column 1, lines 15-25 and page 10, column 2, lines 1-10). Kumar teaches that cellular phones and hand-held devices are used with the invention.

References to specific columns, figures or lines should not be limiting in any way. The entire reference provides disclosure related to the claimed invention.

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments filed 06/27/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. *Applicant argues the Khan does not teach names for a plurality of view pages in a database.* Applicant argues that Khan does not teach an ability to name a plurality of view pages and where the information for the view pages is not stored in a view page database because the applicant asserts that Khan does not relate the creating of views, storing the views and retrieving the views. See Applicant's argument Page 14, Para 1, lines 9-12.

The Examiner disagrees.

Khan expressly teaches the ability to create and retrieve and name a plurality of views and where the system uses a database to store the selected links and windows chosen by the user while configuring the content that is going to be displayed in a given view (see page 6, column 2,lines 50-67 and Figures 2- 4 and page 8, column 1,lines 1-15).

9.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16, 41 and 42 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant

is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS

from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the

mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the

THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the

date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory

period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Steven B. Theriault whose telephone number is (571) 272-5867. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SBT

WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100